

REMARKS

1. Status of Claims

Claims 1-25 were pending in the Application. Applicants appreciate the withdrawal of the previous rejection. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 3, 16, 19 and 22 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-25 will remain pending in the application.

2. Rejections under 35 USC § 112

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 16 and 19. Applicants have corrected the antecedent basis noted. Applicants submit that it is clear in view of the specification that such material received in the window as described may be out of view in a window that extends beyond the current visible screen size. For example, see FIG. 6 and associated text in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims comply with 35 USC 112 and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

3. Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9-10, 14-16 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0278266 A1 by Ogg, et al. ("Ogg '266") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,458 B2 to Shuster ("Shuster '458").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants have amended claim 1 solely to expedite prosecution and the rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references is not proper and even assuming *arguendo* that the combination is proper, the combination does not render the present claims obvious.

For example, Ogg '266 does not teach or suggest sending the first image to a client system program. Furthermore, Shuster '458 describes only multiple frames, but not the use of images in the frames. One of skill in the art would not look to Shuster '458 to modify Ogg '266. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described above.

With reference to dependent Claims 2, 16 and 19 the Examiner cites to Ogg '266 FIG. 9 as teaching a web browser. However, the reference appears to describe a heavy client program and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With reference to Claim 3, Applicants have further amended the claim and respectfully submit that it is patentable over the cited references. With respect to claims 7, 9, 18 and 20-21, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not teach the "overlay", "Sample indicator" or "article abstract" as presently claimed.

With respect to claim 14, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest obtaining a portion of the first image from a different server.

Accordingly, Claims 2-5, 7, 9-10, 14-16 and 19-25 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated above with reference to the independent claim and any intervening claims and as described above.

In section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0278266 A1 by Ogg, et al. ("Ogg '266") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,565 to Lewis, et al. ("Lewis '565").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejected dependent claims are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons described above with reference to the respective independent claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 8 and 17 are patentable over the cited references and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0278266 A1 by Ogg, et al. ("Ogg '266") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220887 A1 by Stickler, et al. ("Stickler '887").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejected dependent claims are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons described above with reference to the respective independent claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited references and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0278266 A1 by Ogg, et al. ("Ogg '266") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220887 A1 by Stickler, et al. ("Stickler '887") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,950 to Davies, et al. ("Davies '950").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejected dependent claims are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons described above with reference to the respective independent claim and any intervening claims.

With regard to claim 13, the cited references do not teach or suggest selectable logic indicators in the second frame.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-13 are patentable over the cited references and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

4. Conclusion Of Remarks

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

5. Authorization

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-684-O1.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-684-O1.

Respectfully submitted,

George M. Macdonald
Reg. No. 39,284
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone (203) 924-3180
PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000